

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 58-82 were pending in this application.

The specification has been objected to because of improper language and format in the abstract of the disclosure.

Claims 58-60, 65-66, 68-71, 76-77, and 79-82 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi U.S. Patent No. 5,982,689 (hereinafter "Takahashi").

Claims 61-64, 67, 72-75, and 78 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant has amended the specification to provide proper language and format in the abstract of the disclosure.

Applicant has amended claims 58, 65, 67-69, 76, 78-80, and 81 to more particularly define applicant's claimed invention. Applicant has cancelled claims 66, 77, and 82 without prejudice.

No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed specification.

Reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Specification

The specification has been objected to because of improper language and format in the abstract of the disclosure. More particularly, the abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because "it uses the phrase 'are presented' in line 3 and 'of the invention advantageously' in lines 11-12, which is implied." (Office Action, p. 3, ¶ 5). The objections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended the abstract as follows:

In line 3, the phrase "are presented" has been changed to --are described--.

In line 11, the phrase "The circuits" has been changed to --These circuits --.

In line 11, the phrase "of the invention" has been deleted.

The foregoing amendments to the abstract of the disclosure are consistent with the amendments made in the parent application (U.S. Patent Application No. 10/233,997, filed August 29, 2002, now U.S. Patent No. 6,728,151).

The Claims

Claims 58-60, 65, 68-71, 76, and 79-81 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi. Claims 61-64, 67, 72-75, and 78 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's invention, as defined by claims 58-65, 67-76, and 78-82, are directed to circuits

and methods for driving an amplifier to amplify a differential voltage between a pair of signal lines to a full digital logic separation (i.e., a full digital "0" on one signal line and a full digital "1" on the other signal line). A switch is provided to raise the voltage at the input terminal of the amplifier to an intermediate voltage between a ground potential and a full supply voltage prior to the development of the differential voltage between the pair of signal lines. Circuitry is also provided to raise the input terminal of the amplifier to the full supply voltage after the differential voltage develops between the pair of signal lines. (Applicant's independent claims 58, 69, and 80, as amended).

The Examiner cites to the Background of the Invention section of Takahashi as showing the features of applicant's independent claims 58, 69, and 80. In particular, the Examiner cites to prior art FIGS. 11 and 12 and the corresponding description at col. 1, lines 15-52. (Office Action, p. 3, ¶ 7).

Contrary to the Examiner's contentions, applicant respectfully submits that Takahashi does not show or suggest a switch operative to raise a voltage at an input terminal of an amplifier "to an intermediate voltage between ground potential and a full supply voltage prior to development of said differential voltage between said pair of signal lines" as recited in applicant's independent claims 58, 69, and 80, as amended (emphasis added). Instead, Takahashi only describes providing two voltages: a "highest power supply potential (VCC)" and a "lowest supply voltage (GND)" (Takahashi,

col. 1, lines 38- 41; and col. 2, lines 33-37). In FIGS. 11 and 12 of Takahashi, the voltages at the input terminals of the sense amplifiers are not raised to an intermediate voltage prior to development of a differential voltage at the output of the respective sense amplifier as described in applicant's approach of independent claims 58, 69, and 80.

For at least the foregoing reason, independent claims 58, 69, and 80 are in condition for allowance. Claims 59-65 and 67-68, which depend from independent claim 58, claims 70-76 and 78-79, which depend from independent claim 69, and claim 81 which depends from independent claim 80, are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/783,976
Amendment Dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak

Evelyn C. Mak
Registration No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicant

Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000